

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, NORTHERN DIVISION

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-609-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-614-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-626-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-628-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-674-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-711-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-712-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-713-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-714-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:17-cv-812-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-012-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-027-MHT-GMB
(WO)

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-395-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
CITY OF MONTGOMERY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-469-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
CITY OF BIRMINGHAM,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

BILL LIETZKE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 2:18-cv-488-MHT-GMB
)	(WO)
GREYHOUND LINES, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

JUDGMENT

In accordance with the memorandum opinion entered today, it is the ORDER, JUDGMENT, and DECREE of the court as follows:

- (1) Plaintiff's objections in each of the above-listed cases are overruled.

(2) The United States Magistrate Judge's recommendation in each listed case is adopted, except for the recommendation of consolidation.

(3) These cases are not consolidated, and shall remain separate.

(4) Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis in each listed case is granted.

(5) Plaintiff's federal claims in each case are dismissed without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

(6) The court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state-law claims, and they are dismissed without prejudice and with leave to refile in state court.

(7) Plaintiff's motions to recuse the magistrate judge are denied in each case.

The clerk of the court is DIRECTED to enter this document on the civil docket in each case as a final judgment pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

These cases are closed.

DONE, this the 23rd day of August, 2018.

/s/ Myron H. Thompson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE